R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 721 JC 680 224

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES.

BY- KILPATRICK, GORDON

EL CAMINO COLL., EL CAMINO COLLEGE, CALIF.

REPORT NUMBER ECC-67-7 PUB DATE AUG 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.92 21P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, *TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, STAFF IMPROVEMENT, INSERVICE PROGRAMS,

THE MAJOR PURPOSES OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION ARE (1) DISCUSSION AND EVENTUAL SOLUTION OF INDIGENOUS PROBLEMS, (2) PRESENTING NEW IDEAS AND METHODS OF TEACHING, (3) KEEPING UP TO DATE ON SUBJECT MATTER, AND (4) ORIENTING NEW TEACHERS, AND REORIENTING OLD TEACHERS TO NEW PHILOSOPHIES. THESE OBJECTIVES ARE CURRENTLY BEING MET BY INSTITUTES, CONFERENCES, CONVENTIONS, WORKSHOPS, FACULTY AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS, CONSULTANTS, UNIVERSITY COURSES, CLASSROOM VISITS, ACTION RESEARCH, AND PROFESSIONAL ON-CAMPUS LIBRARIES. BARRIERS TO INSERVICE TRAINING ARE (1) ACADEMIC (THE DIFFICULTY OF GETTING CREDITS FOR NONACADEMIC WORK), (2) FINANCE (WHO IS TO BEAR THE COST), (3) CERTIFICATION (INAPPLICABLE STATE REQUIREMENTS), (4) ATTITUDE (THE LEARNER MUST NEED AND FEEL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURSE), AND (5) TIME (RELEASED-TIME, SUMMER SESSION, OR OTHER). AMONG THE ELEVEN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ARE (1) FACULTY COMMITMENT TO INSERVICE EDUCATION, AND INVOLVEMENT IN SETTING UP THE PROGRAM, (2) SELECTION OF THE BEST TECHNIQUES, (3) PROVISION OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE REALLY NEEDED, RESOURCES AND TIME, (4) PROVISION OF INCENTIVES IN SALARY OR CREDITS, (5) CERTIFICATION OF COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM, (6) VISITING AMONG TEACHERS, (7) ACTION RESEARCH, (8) POST-DEGREE STUDIES PERTINENT TO CURRENT CLASSROOM NEEDS, AND (9) TEACHER UNDERSTANDING OF JUNIOR COLLEGE OBJECTIVES. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EL CAMINO
ECC [redacted]
67-7
RESEARCH OFFICE

ED020721

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

WITH RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING

ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES

by

Gordon Kilpatrick

August 1967

University of California, Los Angeles

Los Angeles, California

INTRODUCTION[1]

Historically, in-service education has found its manifestation in institutes which through the years slowly evolved into the modern combination of techniques bearing (sometimes erroneously) the same title of "In-service Education." The original purpose of in-service education has also evolved as time progressed. While the original purpose of in-service education was the elimination of deficiencies in teachers' pre-service preparation, it has been supplanted by other purposes, such as fulfilling the needs of teachers to keep abreast of the latest developments in the state of the art and in their specialized fields. This change of purpose is largely the product of improved teacher competency resulting from more rigorous preparation imparted by teacher training institutions, higher educational standards required for certification, and increased ability of the instructional staffs. Not to be overlooked are the efforts expended by the teachers themselves as they attempted to bring about professionalization. These efforts contributed to the causes of the change of purpose of in-service education.

---

[1]Much of the material in this section was taken from Herman G. Richey, "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-service Education," In-service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook, Part I. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

MODERN PURPOSES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

It is convenient to classify the major purposes of modern in-service education into four broad categories:

Category I -To provide opportunity for discussion and eventual solving of indigenous problems.

Category II -To allow communication of new concepts and methodologies in the art of teaching.

Category III-To keep abreast of recent developments in subject matter.

Category IV-To orient new teachers to the philosophies, policies, and procedures of their new job and to orient old teachers to changed philosophies, policies, and procedures.

Transcending all of these are motivation and communication. We must assume, for the purposes of this paper, that those to be served by in-service education have recognized a need for improvement and/or updating and have accepted in-service education as an instrument which may lead to the fulfillment of that need. School district consolidation and near elimination of isolated one-room schools in most of the United States have done much to lower communication barriers, but have by no means eliminated them, even in the face of unprecedented technological developments in communication.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how the four categories of in-service education objectives are met by the various techniques of in-service education as currently practiced, then enumerate and examine the barriers to in-service education, and finally make recommendations for implementation of a program of in-service education in a junior college setting.

THE CURRENT TECHNIQUES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

The various techniques of in-service education practiced today include use of institutes, consultants, faculty meetings, workshops, departmental or grade-level meetings, university courses, classroom visitation, action research, conferences and conventions, and provision of suitable resources such as professional libraries on campus. The particular mix of these techniques varies widely across the country depending upon the character of the district employing these techniques. Each technique has its advantages and disadvantages. Hopefully, administrations will be responsive to the ever-changing needs of their own vicissitous situations and will use these techniques in a program which maximizes their advantages while simultaneously minimizing their disadvantages. Unfortunately some techniques of in-service education have enjoyed popularity among administrators while being despised by the very teachers whom they are meant to serve. The motivational level of such a program virtually precludes satisfactory attainment of worthwhile objectives. Perhaps the administrators are not aware that this is the case. Perhaps they have lost the teacher's viewpoint they themselves once had in the past. Maybe they have cloistered themselves in an authoritarian administrative heirarchy, thus removing themselves from effective communications with the teachers experiencing the problems needing attention from higher up.

It is at this point that the supervisor fills a much-needed role, that of an intermediary. (In junior colleges, supervision is conducted

jointly by the dean of instruction and the respective division chairman). Hopefully, the supervisor is not also cloistered in the administrative heirarchy. As an intermediary, he can listen with consentience and understanding to the teachers' expressions of their problems and needs, and thus serve as a sounding board as he submits his formulated recommendations to the administration.

Perhaps if administrators were aware of the negative effects resulting from the disfavor generated by their well-meaning efforts toward in-service education, the direction of currently fruitless efforts might be changed so as to reap rich harvests from the resources now expended in vain. The trimming back, or even elimination of outmoded techniques no longer applicable to the final third of the twentieth century is much to be desired. Instatement of a combination of modern techniques, utilizing modern technologies of communication, is also to be sought, but this too will be in vain unless the desire and acceptance of such a program is first created in the minds of the teachers whom it is to serve.

The administrator would be well advised if he sought the preferences of the faculty regarding techniques of in-service education. These preferences may be given voice through either the faculty association or faculty senate if such exists on the campus. Likewise, the supervisor may evaluate the acceptability and thus anticipated effectiveness of in-service education programs already in operation by continuously sampling faculty opinion regarding various techniques. His job is made much

more productive in this area if he enjoys the confidence of the faculty.

Table I indicates techniques of in-service education which, in this author's opinion, show most promise in fulfilling the purposes of in-service education as expressed in the various categories. Lack of an indication does not intend lack of value of that technique, rather that its potential effectiveness is considered somewhat less than those checked. Parentheses indicate value with a reservation. The nature of those reservations will be discussed briefly.

TABLE I

	Category I Discussion and problem-solving	Category II New methodologies	Category III New developments in subject matter	Category IV Orientation	Communication
Institutes					
Consultants	(*)			(*)	
Faculty Meetings	(*)			*	*
Workshops	*	(*)	(*)		
Departmental Meetings	*				*
University Courses	(*)		*		
Classroom Visitation		*			
Action Research	*	*			
Conferences and/or Conventions		*	*		
Professional Libraries on Campus		(*)	*	*	

It is interesting that no technique offers a single solution, nor should one be expected to do so. Just as different combinations of media work best in presenting different subjects to differing classes, likewise different combinations of techniques might be more effective for attacking the different types of problems in different school districts. Effective techniques or combinations thereof should be retained and improved if possible; ineffective ones should be terminated or else modified in order to make them effective. Commitment by those involved to the ends of in-service education is the greatest assurance of effectiveness an administrator or supervisor can expect. Failure to obtain this commitment severely limits the accomplishments of the program. For example, the hiring of a consultant would be a waste of money unless the faculty were convinced of the need for one.

Other limitations of techniques indicated by parentheses in Table I include faculty meetings in which discussion is limited due to the lecture-like delivery of the administrator in charge; workshops which heterogeneously group participants to work on problems, regardless of their interests or capabilities; and university courses with vague relevancy to real problems unless perhaps they are created as an extension course to attack a particular problem. It should be elaborated here that classroom visitation as mentioned in Table I should be construed to include intervisitation, viz. the visiting of a teacher's classroom by another teacher. Once the feeling of "invasion of privacy" is defeated and intervisitation becomes an accepted thing, the improvement of instruction as a result of interchange of good

methodological ideas can be realized. A great limitation of the current state of action research is the lack of communication of favorable results. Possibly the eventual creation of a "Journal of Action Research" will help alleviate this problem.

BARRIERS TO IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Beery and Murfin[2] have enumerated five barriers and their rationale as these barriers oppose the conduct of in-service education. It is convenient to adopt their format as a starting point for further elaboration.

The Academic Barrier. Universities are reluctant to grant transcript credit for work in other than rigorous, academically-oriented courses. Extension courses created in answer to a local need do not enjoy popularity at the university. If learning experiences other than course work change the teacher in a manner which adds to his value, then credit of some sort should be allowed. A non-academic transcript proposed later in this paper will elaborate this point further.

The Financial Barrier. School boards which endorse in-service education in principle, are reticent to do so in deed, especially if the expenditure of financial resources is involved. The funding of in-service education programs which include paid conference attendance by teachers, tuition and/or fee payments to universities, teacher's salaries while involved in in-service education projects outside of the classroom and

---

[2]John R. Beery and Mark Murfin, "Meeting Barriers to In-service Education." Educational Leadership 17:351-5, March 1960.

maybe even off the campus, and salary credit for other than university course work will not only motivate the teacher toward self-improvement, but will benefit education through improved instruction as well.

The Certification Barrier. Courses required by the state for certification, but which have only peripheral or incidental applicability to the classroom situation do little to improve instruction. The prospect of enduring such courses discourages rather than motivates some teachers. (The wholesale granting of salary credit for any graduate-level course work, regardless of applicability to the classroom, is also a questionable procedure). The rationale of excluding the ill-prepared teacher from the classroom is valid. To imply that in the absence of credentialing laws, schools would hire the ill-prepared to teach is somewhat perturbing. Junior colleges must sometimes regretfully decline applications from highly qualified industrialists or teachers from other states, merely because of a lack of a complement of education courses, or lack of the "right" course, lack of a properly developed minor, or lack of a Constitution requirement. Experts who have recently acquired a desire to teach, do so successfully elsewhere where credentialing requirements are not so picayune. Meanwhile, teachers who have met these requirements years before stagnate, having forgotten the contents of such courses through disuse.[3] Perhaps these teachers are expert teachers of twenty-five years tenure elsewhere, but have never

---

[3]The comment of Daniel U. Levine is appropriate here: "If pilots were examined and licensed once, and then never re-examined; if continuing supervision were left to their own membership; if pilots trained in the era of the DC3 were permitted to fly jets with no additional training....; it seems likely that far fewer people...would be willing to take a chance on flying." Daniel U. Levine, "On the Popular Art of Teacher Baiting," Clearing House 40: 298-300, January 1966.

practice-taught. They, too, are eliminated from consideration.[4] It is interesting that such highly qualified experts are allowed to teach freshman and sophomore courses in the university, but not the same courses in the junior college.

The Attitude Barrier. In-service education programs which do not take account of individual differences are doomed to failure. Mauth believes that the readiness of the learning teacher is of paramount consideration in the in-service education programs. He further states that the goals of the learner will direct his activities. Active involvement of the learner facilitates learning which is a continuous process further facilitated by reinforcement.[5] Gilchrist emphasizes that a good in-service education program should be centered around individual problems of individual teachers rather than a central theme.[6] Beery and Murfin join in condemning an in-service education program which assumes that everyone is equally interested in the same problem.[7] In-service education will continue to dwell in infamy in those districts whose efforts in the name of in-service education are still frought with such assumptions. To overcome the negative or apathetic attitudes of teachers toward in-service education will require a change of direction in some districts. A recognition of its purpose by

---

[4]Stradly has developed an excellent case for experience providing a better criterion than more college courses for teacher improvement and recredentialing. William E. Stradly, "The Periennial Student, Must a Teacher Go To College All His Life?" Clearing House 36:500-1, April 1962.

[5]Leslie J. Mauth, "Psychology and the In-service Education Program," National Elementary Principal 41:13-16, February 1962.

[6]Robert S. Gilschrist, "Highway to Quality Teaching," National Education Association Journal 48:18-19, May 1959.

[7]Beery and Murfin, op. cit.

both teachers and administrators alike, perhaps even through in-service education itself, will be a start. Cultivation of positive attitudinal motivations can be helped by incentives under which reward is given for proven improvement subsequent to completion of in-service education projects.

Time Barrier. No program of in-service education, no matter how well-planned otherwise, can succeed if inadequate time is allowed for its implementation. Faculty members inundated with multiple preparations, large classes, and full-day schedules can hardly welcome additional inroads upon their time. Released time from other duties is one solution if the district is willing to obtain sufficient personnel to assume the released duties. This method is especially attractive for projects needing implementation during the school year. An alternative is summer employment for in-service education project work. This might best be housed in a 12-month schedule under which a teacher might select a school term other than summer for project work and a month's vacation. Some junior colleges have converted to this year-round operation and the trend is toward increased use of this form of scheduling for in-service education projects.

As an addendum to the time barrier, it would also be appropriate to mention the "timeliness barrier." Projects scheduled at the end of long school days can hardly be expected to be as productive as those scheduled during the earlier hours when creative processes have not been dulled by fatique.

THE RATIONALE FOR CHANGE

Teachers are better prepared today than ever before. The faculty of a junior college represents a team of experts, most of whom are required to hold a masters degree. The problem of correcting pre-service deficiencies

via in-service education has long lost its applicability since the advent and upgrading of credentialing requirements. Faculty members are insulted by required institutes or lecture-type faculty meetings intended to enlighten them with information they already have. They have developed their own cultural tastes and thus reject imposed lyceum series. They would rather be consulted or consult among themselves than to be told what to do. They accept the "insulting consultant" only if they first recognize the need and initiate the request for such services themselves. Frequently the answers to problems exist within the faculty, only no one ever asked. Not only may the role filled by an outside consultant often be filled from within, but many faculty members may indeed be rendering consulting services to other school districts.

At the same time, however, though these educators are experts in their separate fields, many junior college teachers are not aware of the purposes and philosophies of the schools in which they teach,[8] or of the general education courses which they themselves do teach. This in itself is an indictment of past in-service education and a challenge to future in-service education programs.

What is needed is a new way of looking at in-service education. Recognition of the need to be filled is the first step. Recognition of the resources available for filling this need is the second. As pointed out above, the talents within the faculty itself are to be included in any inventory of available resources. When needed resources are not available, consideration should be given at this time to obtaining them and making them available. By obtaining faculty help in formulating a plan of solving the problem, we also obtain a degree of acceptance in the minds of the faculty that (1) a need

---

[8]Charles B. Green, "The Problems of the Beginning Junior College Instructor" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1960), p. 194.

exists, (2) the need can be filled via the plan, and (3) the method of implementation will be acceptable to the faculty. (The reader will note that the above steps in approaching in-service education anew are entirely consistent with the principles of in-service education as enumerated by both Cushman and Misner--see Appendix.) Voluntary participation with incentives to award participants consistent with degree of accomplishment would raise the level of motivation and hopefully promulgate a high morale. Such would mark the demise of the widespread current policy of "If it's voluntary, the teacher pays for it; if it's required, the district pays for it."

It is appropriate at this late point to define in-service education as all activities engaged in by the professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job.[9] If in-service education as defined above and expressed in the various techniques is indeed education, some sort of transferable credit, perhaps via a new type of transcript, should be allowed for not only college courses, but also for learning experiences gained from other sources. If the ideas exchanged at a conference, convention, or seminar make the individual teacher more valuable, then salary credit should be allowed. The idea of transferable credit via transcript is fostered since presumably that teacher is also more valuable to other potential employers as well and his mobility need not be restricted by salary considerations based on only one facet of his total education.

Problems solved for a district not only add to the learning experience of problem solver, but benefit the district as well. Yet, current practice rewards the problem solver nothing above his basic salary as determined by

---

[9]C. Glenn Hass, "In-service Education Today," In-service Education. National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) p. 13.

the number of university credits if he be a teacher. Yet many courses taken merely for salary advancement have vague relevancy to the teacher's classroom behavior and the district benefits little if any as a result. It is recognized that university courses are an important part of a teacher's education, but perhaps the present emphasis is disproportionate. Perhaps salary advancement should be correlated with the total education of the individual teacher. The sacred annual step increase in salary based on the myth that the worth of the individual teacher is correlated somehow with his longevity merely rewards the status quo. Perphaps it should be replaced with reward commensurate with solid evidence of improvement in teacher behavior.[10]

Consider the economic aspects of in-service education of the businessman contrasted with that of the teacher. The businessman is paid his salary twelve months per year. Advancement may be obtained as a result of on-the-job experiences. Bonuses are given for solving significant problems. If additional training is needed, he is paid his full salary plus expenses while attending school, with any tuition and fees paid for by the company. Meanwhile, the teacher is paid his salary only ten months per year, usually earning less per month than his businessman counterpart of comparable background. (A teacher's twelve-month salary is usually the same annual salary paid out in smaller installments.) Advancement requires attendance at a university with the teacher absorbing all of the expenses during a time when he has no salary coming in. The other financial perquisites are absent. The only compensating factors are (1) sabbatical leaves which "may" be obtained if geographic immobility for seven or more years is demonstrated and further immobility is endured for two years following, (2) reward of status quo via the annual step increase, and (3) tenure. A system of in-service education which not only grants credit for learning experiences obtained, whatever the form,

---

[10]Gordon Kilpatrick, "A Fresh Look at Teacher Evaluation in American Junior Colleges," (unpublished paper, March 1967).

but also is funded in full by the employing district, possibly at the expense of the partial or total demise of the three numbered perquisites above, would contribute greatly to the long sought modernization and professionalization of the pedagogical realm.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Administration should seek to engender a commitment to in-service education in the faculty. The vehicle might itself be an in-service education project.

2. Involve faculty associations in setting up programs of in-service education. In addition to obtaining the benefits of collective thinking, an increased level of involvement and commitment will be obtained. Opinionnaires which discover the techniques of in-service education most desirable to the faculty and thus show most promise motivationally will suggest procedures of implementation of such a program. The maximum level of commitment and involvement by the entire faculty should be sought continuously.

3. The combination of techniques which show most promise in potential ability to achieve the desired ends most efficiently should be used. This would be indicated by the nature of the techniques, their acceptability as indicated by the aforementioned opinionnaire, the ends to be sought, and the particular situational environment in which the techniques are to be applied.

4. Be responsive to needs for in-service education. At the same time assure that problems selected for study are real rather than a district-wide theme which may not relate to the real problems of a significant segment of the teachers. A method suggested by Gilchrist et al for selecting problems for study is for the supervisor to jot down problems as they are heard in spontaneous and informal situations.[11] Teachers are reluctant to admit they have problems when asked formally. Problems which indicate prevalence by frequent recurrence in the list will probably deserve to be those selected for study.

---

[11]Robert S. Gilchrist, Clarence Fielstra, and Anna L. Davis, "Organization of Programs of In-Service Education," In-service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook, Part I. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

5. Provide resources and time for in-service education. Released time to teachers for project work, conference attendance, or even a university course should be provided at no loss of pay if the nature of the in-service education warrants. Year-round operation with one month paid vacation for teachers and the remainder of a "no-classes term" (I resisted using the word "off") devoted to in-service education is a desirable goal. The "no-classes term" need not necessarily be the summer term.

6. Provide incentives such as salary hurdle credit for in-service education projects which make the faculty member more valuable. At the same time, make them optional. Conceivably, credit could be allowed for workshops and conferences as well as university courses where a teacher's instruction improves as a result of participation. Administrators should no longer be the only participants whose salary and expenses are paid while in attendance. Just as in business, salary, expenses, AND credit should be allowed for workshops, conferences, AND course work.

7. Since such a program may divert teachers away from strictly university courses where transcript credit has been allowed, some written document attesting the increased value of the individual teacher as a result of alternative techniques should be devised. This could be a non-academic transcript of some sort indicating participation in workshops, conferences, seminars, and other worthwhile learning experiences.

8. Increased use of intervisitation among teachers should be encouraged as a normal technique of in-service education.

9. More action research and communication of the findings should be accomplished.

10. Careful examination of academic courses taken after highest degree should be conducted to ascertain the value to the improvement of the classroom behavior of the teacher. A study of the complete literary works of John Donne may add little to improvement of a junior college teacher of remedial English composition. Since under this program alternative paths to salary hurdle credit are proposed, less credit than currently allowed may apply to courses of vague relevancy. Where a higher degree is obtained, credit should be allowed consistent with relevancy to the classroom and value toward improving teacher behavior in the classroom.

> 11. A worthy goal of in-service education in the junior college should be an inculcation of the philosophies and objectives of the junior college and of general education in the minds of teachers. Unfortunately many junior college teachers are not aware of the purposes of either and conduct their classes as if performing a screening function for the university. In actuality, far less than one-third of junior college students ultimately transfer to higher educational institutions. An awareness, developed through in-service education, of the students' characteristics and goals would assist in understanding the aforementioned philosophies and objectives. Thus the junior college would better fulfill its function in the community.

A program of in-service education differs little from any other program in its manner of establishment. Any well planned program will follow these basic steps:

1. State objectives.
2. Plan for implementation.
3. Implement consistent with objectives.
4. Evaluate.

Presumably, the provision of adequate resources is a part of step two. All too often, step four is forgotten.

An in-service education program should not be preoccupied as in the past with what pre-service educational institutions failed to do. Modern programs should deal with the real problems of today, new problems which did not exist at the time of pre-service training. It should cause a change in some facet of teacher behavior, for if it does not, what is its justification?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beery, John R., and Mark Murfin. "Meeting Barriers to In-service Education," Educational Leadership, 17:351-5, March 1960.

Cushman, C. L. "Reflections on Teacher Education In-service," Educational Leadership, 7:41-42, October 1949.

Fielstra, Clarence. "Evaluation of Supervisory Techniques Used in California Schools," California Journal for Instructional Improvement, 2:14, March 1959.

Gilchrist, Robert S. "Highway to Quality Teaching," National Educational Association Journal, 48:18-19, May 1959.

Gilchrist, Robert S., Clarence Fielstra, and Anna L. Davis. "Organization of Programs of In-service Education," In-service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Green, Charles B. "The Problems of the Beginning Junior College Instructor" Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1960.

Hass, C. Glenn. "In-service Education Today," In-service Education, National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Kilpatrick, Gordon. "A Fresh Look at Teacher Evaluation in American Junior Colleges." Unpublished paper, Los Angeles, March 1967.

Levine, Daniel U. "On the Popular Art of Teacher Baiting," Clearing House, 40:298-300, January 1966.

Mauth, Leslie J. "Psychology and the In-service Education Program," National Elementary Principal, 41:13-16, February 1962.

Misner, Paul J. "In-service Education Comes of Age," The Journal of Teacher Education, 1:33-34, March 1950.

National Society for the Study of Education. In-service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, 56th Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Richey, Herman G. "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-service Education," In-service Education. National Society for the Study of Education, 56th Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Sheets, Linn. "Experienced Teachers Also Have Problems," Journal of Teacher Education, 12:121-4, March 1961.

Stradly, William E. "The Perennial Student--Must a Teacher Go To College All His Life?" Clearing House, 36:500-1, April 1962.

APPENDIX

THE SIX PRINCIPLES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION[12]

Principle I: The work of the teacher in the classroom and in the related activities of the school and community should be the most important single source of problems which form the basis of in-service education problems.

Principle II: The two basic elements essential to the in-service education of every teacher are an understanding of the nature of human growth and development, and an understanding of the nature of the social order.

Principle III: In-service education should be characterized by a conscious and direct relationship between thought and action.

Principle IV: The motivation for effective in-service education should come from within the learner and his sense of need rather than from someone else's desire to change him.

Principle V: The major motivating factor for in-service growth should be the desire to meet fully one's responsibilities as a teacher and as a person.

Principle VI: The focus of one's sense of responsibility should be service in the world of our years.

---

12. C. L. Cushman, "Reflections on Teacher Education In-service," Educational Leadership, 7:41-42, October 1949.

PRINCIPLES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION[13]

1. What is done in an in-service program should be decided cooperatively and democratically.

2. A good in-service program requires skillful and extensive planning.

3. Leadership in the in-service program is the function of all individuals who are willing and competent to exercise it.

4. The effective in-service program will progressively involve all individuals who are directly or indirectly concerned with the operation of the schools.

---

13. Paul J. Misner, "In-service Education Comes of Age," The Journal of Teacher Education, 1:33-34, March 1950.